arXiv:1701.06946v1 [physics.soc-ph] 14 Jan 2017

Social Balance and the Bernoulli Equation

J. J. P. Veerman*

January 25, 2017

Abstract

Since the 1940's there has been an interest in the question why social networks often give rise to two antagonistic factions. Recently a dynamical model of how and why such a balance might occur was developed. This note provides an introduction to the notion of social balance and a new (and simplified) analysis of that model. We show that if we allow more general initial conditions that previously considered, the two factions give rise to two additional factions. The new factions are internally very divided but each is attracted to one of the old factions. If the old factions join forces they will have a majority.

1 Introduction

Since the 1940's there has been an interest in the question why finite social networks often give rise to two antagonistic factions [5, 4, 3]. Motivated by insights from the field of social psychology (most notably by Heider [5]), Harary [4] and Cartwright and Harary [3] developed a formal graph theoretical framework for social balance that was consistent with Heider's ideas. They were able to prove that a sign symmetric network is balanced if and only if it has (at most) two factions (see below for the definitions). This became know as the *structure theorem*. We will denote these factions by Left and Right. Until recently however a dynamical model of how and why such a balance occurs was lacking.

The field received an impetus in 2011 when in [6] Marvel ea successfully analyzed the dynamics of the matrix differential equation

$$\dot{X} = X^2 \quad ; \quad X(0) = X_0 \tag{1.1}$$

The interpretation of this model is that the entries of the $n \times n$ matrix X represent the opinions of individuals $\{1, \cdots n\}$ towards one another. The value of the entry x_{ij} of X indicates the *strength of the friendliness* ([6]) of individual i towards individual j. The modeling becomes clear if we write out the differential equation for one entry:

$$\dot{x}_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} x_{ik} x_{kj} \tag{1.2}$$

Thus individual i communicates somehow with all individuals $k \in \{1, \cdots n\}$. If i's feeling about k is positive, then k's feeling about j will pull i's opinion in the same direction. On the other hand, if i's opinion about k is negative, then i's opinion about j will change in the direction opposite to k's opinion about j. This *implies roughly that ... one's friends' friends will tend to become one's friends and one's enemies' enemies also ones friends, and one's enemies' friends and one's friends' enemies will tend to become one's enemies* (in the words of [8]). Since friendliness is difficult to quantize, one is led to study the problem with the initial value X_0 being a *random* matrix.

To perform the analysis of Equation 1.1, the authors of [6] assumed the matrix X_0 is symmetric. (This was later extended to *normal* matrices [12].) The analysis itself now proceeded in two parts. The first is to solve the differential equation 1.1 by considering it a special case of a *matrix Riccati equation* (see [9]). This solution is subject to certain conditions, the most important of which are that X_0 has a positive real eigenvalue, and that the largest of these real

*Fariborz Maseeh Dept. of Math. and Stat., Portland State Univ.; e-mail: veerman@pdx.edu

eigenvalues, λ, has algebraic and geometric multiplicity 1. The second part of the analysis is to show that for a random symmetric matrix X_0 these hypotheses hold with probability tending to 1 as the dimension n grows unbounded. This involves relying on fairly subtle arguments about eigenvalues of random symmetric matrices (see [1]).

In this note we propose a simpler and more precise treatment of this problem. In Section 2, we give a very simple proof of a generalization of the structure theorem. In it the hypothesis that the network be sign symmetric has been dropped. In Section 3, we treat Equation 1.1 not as a Riccati equation but as a special case of a *Bernoulli equation* (first mentioned in [2], see also [11] and other contemporary text books). This simplifies our treatment and has the advantage that we can characterize much more precisely than previously what happens for non-symmetric (or non-normal) initial conditions X_0. We make use of a recent study ([10]) of random (non-symmetric) matrices to assert that also in this case with probability tending to 1 as the dimension n tends to infinity, X_0 has a leading real, simple, positive eigenvalue. As a result we are able to show that with overwhelming probability a random initial condition X_0 (not symmetric or normal), will lead to four factions. The old Left and Right factions are now joined by two other groups that are internally divided and one of which is attracted to the Left (though not vice versa) and similarly the other to the Right. Finally we show in Section 4 that the if old Left and Right join forces, they can be expected to have a narrow majority. This last result is new.

Finally we remark on a later development. In [12] a slightly different model for social balance is proposed, namely the differential equation in 1.1 is replaced by $\dot{X} = XX^T$. This model gives rise to two factions with high probability under general initial conditions. The analysis is substantially more complicated. It appears that the simplification we propose here does not help in the study of this model.

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Patrick de Leenheer for his insightful comments.

2 What is Social Balance?

The *signed directed graph* G on n vertices is a collection V of n vertices together with a set E of directed edges between certain ordered pairs of vertices whose weights are positive or negative. The graph G is *sign symmetric* if for every pair u and v in V, all weights of any edges between u and v are either all positive or all negative. An *undirected path or cycle* in a directed graph G is a non self-intersecting path or cycle following edges without any regard for their direction. A cycle or path is called *positive* if the product of the weights encountered along the cycle or path is positive, and *negative* if that product is negative. An *undirected component* of G is a maximal subgraph all of whose vertices can be connected by undirected paths.

Definition 2.1 *A directed graph G is called* balanced *if every undirected cycle is positive.*

In the context of social dynamics, this definition is essentially due to Harary [4] and Cartwright and Harary [3] expanding on earlier concepts by Heider [5]. The idea is that presumably in a state of imbalance *pressures will arise to change it toward a state of balance* in the words of [3].

Definition 2.2 *A directed graph G is said to have* two factions *if the vertices can be partitioned into (at most) two sets U_0 and U_1, such that all edges entirely within U_0 or within U_1 have positive weights, while those that connect the two have negative weights.*

The main result here is the simple but surprising conclusion that these two definitions are equivalent for undirected graphs. This result, the *structure theorem*, was proved in [3, 4] for undirected graphs. We give a slight generalization here.

Theorem 2.3 *A directed graph with signed weights G is balanced if and only if it has two factions U_0 and U_1.*

Proof: Without loss of generality we may assume that G has one undirected component. By definition G is balanced iff every undirected cycle is positive. But that is true iff for all u and v in V any two undirected paths connecting u and v have the same sign. In turn this is equivalent to partitioning the vertices in V as follows. Start with a vertex u and call its faction U_0. For any $v \in V$, v is in U_π where π is the (unique) parity of the paths from u to v. ■

Historical remark: From a graph G with two factions we obtain a *bipartite* graph H by deleting all its positive edges. One thus sees without much trouble that the above result is in fact equivalent to a result published by D. König in 1916 [13], namely that a graph is bipartite if and only if it has no odd cycles.

3 When does Social Balance Evolve?

Definition 3.1 *An $n \times n$ matrix X is called* typical *if it is a real matrix that satisfies all of the following conditions:*
1) $\det X_0 \neq 0$.
2) X_0 has a positive real eigenvalue.
3) The largest positive real eigenvalue λ of X_0 is simple.

Let M_n be an ensemble of real $n \times n$ matrices so whose entries have independent Gaussian distribution with mean zero and variance one. Tao and Vu proved that if n is even then matrices in M_n will have some real eigenvalues with probability tending to 1 as n tends to infinity ([10], Corollary 17). In addition, most of these eigenvalues will be simple (Corollary 18). They add a comment in which they conjecture that in fact with overwhelming probability *none* of the eigenvalues should be repeated. For this reason we use the characterization *typical* in the above definition.

To facilitate the proof of the next result, we introduce some notation. Let X_0 be a typical $n \times n$ matrix with leading (real, simple, positive) eigenvalue λ. The unit eigenvector associated with λ will be called v. Denote by W the span of all (generalized) eigenspaces other than span$\{v\}$. Let w be the vector determined by:

$$w \in W^\perp \quad \text{and} \quad (w, v) = 1$$

where $(.,.)$ is the standard inner-product in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (see Figure 3.1). Finally we choose an *orthonormal* basis $\{w_2, \cdots w_n\}$ for W. Note that w is not a unit vector unless v happens to be in $W^\perp$. In that case $w = v$.



Figure 3.1: *Schematic representation of W, w, and v in $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

Theorem 3.2 *Let n be even and let $X_0 \in M_n$ be a typical $n \times n$ matrix (see Definition 3.1). Then with probability tending to 1 as n tends to ∞, the (matrix valued) initial value problem*

$$\dot{X} = X^2 \quad ; \quad X(0) = X_0 \tag{3.1}$$

has a unique solution for $t \in [0, \lambda^{-1})$ and near $t = \lambda^{-1}$ the solution diverges as follows:

$$\lim_{t \nearrow \lambda^{-1}} \left(\lambda^{-1} - t\right) X = vw^T \tag{3.2}$$

Proof: Upon substitution of $Z = X^{-1}$, the differential equation given in 3.1 transforms into

$$\dot{Z} = -I \quad ; \quad Z(0) = X_0^{-1}$$

(where we used condition 1). The solution is:

$$Z(t) = X_0^{-1} - tI \qquad \text{or} \qquad X(t) = \left(X_0^{-1} - tI\right)^{-1} \tag{3.3}$$

It is unique and exists until it diverges.

Now recall the notation in the paragraph prior to the theorem. Let P be the matrix whose first column is v and whose i-th column is w_i for $i > 1$:

$$P = [v, w_2, \cdots w_n]$$

By its definition P is invertible and using conditions 2 and 3 we have

$$X_0 = P \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \lambda & 0^T \\ \hline 0 & \tilde{X}_0 \end{array}\right) P^{-1} \tag{3.4}$$

This uncouples the first component from the rest of the system. By using Equation 3.3), we obtain that for $t \in [0, \lambda^{-1})$

$$\begin{aligned} X(t) &= P \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \left(\lambda^{-1} - t\right)^{-1} & 0^T \\ \hline 0 & \left(\tilde{X}_0^{-1} - tI\right)^{-1} \end{array}\right) P^{-1} \\ &= P \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \left(\lambda^{-1} - t\right)^{-1} & 0^T \\ \hline 0 & \mathbf{0} \end{array}\right) P^{-1} + P \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & 0^T \\ \hline 0 & \left(\tilde{X}_0^{-1} - tI\right)^{-1} \end{array}\right) P^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

By hypothesis the largest real eigenvalue of $\tilde{X}_0$ is less than λ, and so in the interval $[0, \lambda^{-1}]$ the second term is uniformly bounded by a constant.

Finally $P^{-1}P = 1$ implies that the first row r of P^{-1} satisfies:

$$(r, v) = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \forall i > 1 : \ (r, w_i) = 0$$

Therefore the first row of P^{-1} equals w. The above relation for $X(t)$ now gives:

$$X(t) = \left(\lambda^{-1} - t\right)^{-1} vw^T + \mathcal{O}(1)$$

Multiplying both sides by $\left(\lambda^{-1} - t\right)$ implies the theorem. ■

Remark: By transposing Equation 3.4, we see that in fact w is a eigenvector of X_0^T associated with λ. Equivalently, it is a *left* eigenvector of X_0.

Corollary 3.3 *If X_0 satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 3.2, then*

$$\lim_{t \nearrow \lambda^{-1}} \left(\lambda^{-1} - t\right) X = vv^T$$

if and only if the left and right eigenvectors associated to λ of X_0 are the same.

This easily implies that for t close to λ^{-1} and up to permutation of the coordinates, $X(t)$ has the block-form

$$\operatorname{sgn} X(t) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} + & - \\ \hline - & + \end{array}\right)$$

This means that the individuals have split into two factions (one possibly being empty). Using the terminology of the previous section, we say that in this case X has two factions. Individuals from each faction like each other among themselves, but they dislike individuals from the other faction. The cases discussed in the literature are X_0 is symmetric ([6]) or normal ([12]). In these cases all eigenspaces are orthogonal, and so we easily recover that $w \in W^{\perp}$. One does need to prove that in the more restricted setting of symmetric or normal matrices, the typical case still has overwhelming probability. This is done in the literature cited.

We can improve Corollary 3.3 somewhat noticing the following.

Corollary 3.4 *If X_0 satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 3.2, then for t close to λ^{-1}, $X(t)$ has 2 factions if and only if the left and right eigenvectors associated with λ fall in the same* orthant*, ie: their components have the same signs.*

We note finally that the vectors v is as likely a choice for the eigenvector associated to λ as it its negative $-v$. It follows that they are equally probable and so the Left and Right factions both have expected size $\frac{1}{2}(n+1)$.

4 What if Social Balance Does Not Evolve?

Let v and w be defined as in the previous section. Theorem 3.2 implies that for t close to λ^{-1} the matrix $X(t)$ has the sign pattern of vw^T. Permute the components so that the first $K \approx \frac{n}{2}$ components of v are positive and the others negative. After that, permute the first K components so that within it, the positive components of w and the negative ones are grouped together, and so forth. It follows that for t close to λ^{-1}, X has the following sign pattern:

$$\operatorname{sgn} X(t) = \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} + & - & + & - \\ + & - & + & - \\ \hline - & + & - & + \\ - & + & - & + \end{array}\right)$$

Notice that this matrix is not sign symmetric and thus the system is not balanced.

Thus the old Left and Right cohesive factions now give rise to two additional factions that are internally very divided but of which one is attracted to the old Left and the other to the old Right. An interesting prediction is that if in this situation the old Left and Right join forces they will have a majority.

Theorem 4.1 *Let X_0 satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 3.2. Assume furthermore that v is uniformly distributed in N_u. Then the expected number k of sign disagreements between u and v satisfies:*

$$\frac{n+1}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{n}{2\pi}}\left(1 + \frac{11}{12n}\right) < k < \frac{n+1}{2}$$

The Theorem is a direct consequence of the Proposition below. Let v and w as in Section 3 and define $u = \frac{w}{||w||}$. Consider the "Northern" hemisphere

$$N_u = \{v \in S^n \,|\, (u, v) \geq 0\}$$

of the standard sphere S^n embedded in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Furthermore define $f_u : N_u \to \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$f_u(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \operatorname{sgn} v_i \operatorname{sgn} u_i = n + 1 - 2k$$

where k is the number of sign disagreements between the components of the vectors v and u. Then if v is uniformly distributed in N_u, the expected value of $n + 1 - 2k$ equals

$$I_u^+ = \frac{1}{\operatorname{vol} N_u} \int_{N_u} f_u(v)\, dS^n$$

where dS^n is the density of the Lebesgue measure on S^n.

Proposition 4.2 *Let n even. Given $u \in S^n$, then*

$$0 < I_u^+ < \sqrt{\frac{2n}{\pi}}\left(1 + \frac{11}{12n}\right)$$

Proof: Let I_u^- be the average of f_u over the "Southern" hemisphere $\{v \in S^n \,|\, (u,v) \leq 0\}$. We first show that $I_u^+ > I_u^-$. Suppose the angle ϕ parametrizes some geodesic that connects the "South pole", $-u$ where $\phi = 0$, to the "North pole", u where $\phi = \pi$. It is easy to see that for any i, $\operatorname{sgn} u_i \operatorname{sgn} v_i(\phi)$ is an increasing function, and in fact the function has a strictly positive increase over its domain. The same therefore is true for $f_u(v)$. Thus $I_u^+ > I_u^-$. Since $f_u(-v) = -f_u(v)$ we have that the integral of f_u over S^n yields zero, or $I_u^+ + I_u^- = 0$. Together with the inequality, this implies that $0 < I_u^+$.

To get the other inequality, we first partition S^n into *orthants* O_σ. For every $\sigma \in \{-1,+1\}^{n+1}$:

$$O_\sigma = \{v \in S^n \,|\, (\operatorname{sgn} u_1 \operatorname{sgn} v_1,\ \operatorname{sgn} u_2 \operatorname{sgn} v_2, \cdots,\ \operatorname{sgn} u_{n+1} \operatorname{sgn} v_{n+1}) = \sigma\}$$

Now let Q be the quotient of $\{-1,+1\}^{n+1}$ and multiplication by -1. It can be parametrized by those binary sequences s that have positive average. Define

$$Z_s = (O_s \cup O_{-s}) \cap N_u$$

The sets Z_s partition the N_u into 2^n sets of equal measure (up to measure zero). For all v in the set Z_s, $f_u(v)$ equals either $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} s_i$ or $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} (-s_i)$. Thus

$$I_u^+ \leq 2^{-n} \sum_{s \in Q} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} s_i \right)$$

The sum $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} s_i$ is equal to $n+1-2k$ where k is the number of sign differences. There are $\binom{n+1}{k}$ distinct sequences s that have k sign differences. We get by telescoping

$$2^{-n} \sum_{s \in Q} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} s_i \right) = 2^{-n} \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{n}{2}} \binom{n+1}{k} [(n+1-k)-k] = 2^{-n} (n+1) \binom{n}{\frac{n}{2}}$$

Now use Stirling's Formula in the following form ([7], section 3.6):

$$n! = \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n \left(1 + \frac{1}{12n} + \frac{1}{288n^2} + \cdots\right)$$

The Proposition follows after some straightforward algebra. ■

The prediction of Theorem 4.1 depends on the the assumption that v is uniformly distributed in N_u. It would seem reasonable that for *any* distribution $d\rho$ of v in N_u compatible with the problem, we would have that the expectation of the number of sign disagreements between u and v is strictly less than $\frac{n}{2}$. If the distribution $d\rho$ of v is more biased towards the vicinity of the pole u, then the majority of a united Left and Right will be more pronounced. On the contrary, if the distribution is more biased towards the equator, then that majority will be narrower.

References

[1] L. Arnold, *On Wigner's Semicircle Law for the Eigenvalues of random Matrices*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie Verw. Geb. 19, 191-198, 1971.

[2] J. Bernoulli, *Explicationes, Annotiones, and Additiones ad ea...*, Acta Eruditorum, 537-553, Dec 1695.

[3] D. Cartwright and F. Harary, *Structural Balance: a Generalization of Heider's Theory*, Psychological Review 63 (1956), no. 5, 277-293.

[4] F. Harary, *On the Notion of Balance of a Signed Graph*, Michigan Math. J. 2, no. 2, 143–146, 1953.

[5] F. Heider, *Attitudes and Cognitive Organization*, J Psychol 21: 107112, 1946.

[6] S. Marvel, J. Kleinberg, R. Kleinberg, and S. Strogatz, *Continuous-Time Model of Structural Balance*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 108 (2011), no. 5, 1771-1776.

[7] J. Mathews, J. R.Walker, *Mathematical Methods of Physics* Second Edition, W. A. Benjamin, New York, 1970.

[8] A. Rapoport, *Mathematical models of social interaction*, in: *Handbook of Mathematical Sociology*, editors: R.A. Galanter, R.R. Lace, E. Bush, vol 2, 493-580, Wiley & Sons, 1963.

[9] W. T. Reid, *A Matrix Differential Equation of Riccati Type*, American Journal of Mathematics 68 (1946), no. 2, 237-246.

[10] T. Tao, V. Vu, *Random Matrices: Universality of Local Spectral Statistics of Non-Hermitian Matrices*, Annals Prob, Vol 43, No 2, 782-874, 2015.

[11] G. Teschl, *Ordinary Differential Equations and Dynamicsl Systems*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol 140, AMS, 2012.

[12] V. A. Traag, P. Van Dooren, and P. De Leenheer, *Dynamical Models Explaining Social Balance and Evolution of Cooperation*, PLOS ONE 8 (2013), no. 4, e60063.

[13] D. König, *Über Graphen und Ihre Anwendung auf Determinantentheorie und Mengenlehre*, Mathematische Annalen, Vol 77, 453-465, 1916.